

PROVIDENCE (R.I.)

BULLETIN

Circ.: e. 145,400

Approved For Release 2000/08/24 : CIA-RDP70-00058R00010013

SEP 10 1956

Front	Edit	Other
Page	Page	Page

Date: 9/10/56

A Review of Our Foreign Policy Is Needed

CPYRGHT

In this election year, it is inevitable that political shadings tend to color evaluations of any given national issue, including America's foreign policy. Therefore, it should neither shock nor confuse when President Eisenhower honestly finds the free world "stronger" today than in 1953, while his Democratic adversary, Adlai Stevenson, views with alarm America's "waning influence" abroad.

There are large elements of truth in both statements, although neither assertion encompasses all facets — both good and bad — of America's standing in the East-West conflict.

It certainly is true, as President Eisenhower pointed out in last week's press conference, that the Republican administration has notched many important achievements in the Cold War against Soviet imperialism. By finding acceptable terms by which to end the fighting in Korea and Indochina, the Republican administration removed two extremely serious threats to world peace.

Settlement of the Italian-Yugoslav dispute over Trieste, prevention of a Communist Party coup in Iran and the ouster of a Communist regime from Guatemala were accomplished with varying degrees of direct or covert American help and strengthened the free world.

The United States also gained in stature by its steadfast protection of Formosa and the free world achieved a moral triumph in the roll back of the Red Tide from Austria. Most recently, Secretary of State Dulles' handling of the Suez situation markedly increased the free world's trust in the maturity of American leadership.

Although it must be admitted in all fairness that Democratic policies set the original course in several of these issues, it also must be conceded the Republicans carried the policies to success. By the code of prac-

tical politics, the Republicans can claim the lion's share of the credit, just as they must expect to be blamed for badly deteriorating situations they did not necessarily create.

And there is the dark side of the picture — the only side the Democrats see when they charge Republican policies are losing the Cold War. This is also the side President Eisenhower largely ignored.

In Europe, France is severely weakened by her costly war of attrition with Algeria. The political stability of West Germany is at best shaken over reunification and rearmament. England, caught in an inflationary spiral, fights for its economic life against looming trade deficits. Cyprus has become the pawn that has revived bitter enmities between Turkey and Greece, while Yugoslavia edges closer to the renovated communism of the Soviet Union. Each of these problems saps the vi-

tality of NATO. Meanwhile, the security of U.S. air bases from Iceland to Saudi Arabia becomes increasingly uncertain.

The pistol that Secretary of State Dulles presented to Egyptian General Naguib, predecessor of President Nasser, backfired with a bang that is altogether too obvious not only along the Suez but in the Israel-Arab duel that seems no closer to solution now than in 1948.

Farther East, Indonesian and Afghan problems multiply, ripening those two neutral states for the "parliamentary compromise" with Soviet communism, of which CIA director, Allen Dulles, recently warned. Even in India, Red China's major contender in the Far East, many are beginning to incline toward the Soviet Union instead of the United States over such emotional issues as the disputed territories of Kashmir and Goa.

The free world debits in the Cold War ledger stem largely from the Soviet Union's new "soft sell" and as yet do not pose lethal threats. Yet, each is loaded with political high explosive, made more dangerous by unavoidable election year "blindness."

Therefore, President Eisenhower's appointment of Benjamin F. Fairless, retired head of the United States Steel Corp., as chairman of a citizens committee to analyze with a nonpartisan eye the entire range of American foreign aid and foreign policy, must be welcome.

Of course, neither the Fairless committee nor parallel Senate and House study groups could possibly complete their work in time to clarify election claims and charges. But the very existence of such partisan differences over foreign policy in these critical times attests to the need for unbiased and responsible review before the next session of Congress.



The Doctors Disagree

—Brett, Miami Herald